OIPE
SEP 28 2005
IAP87
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IFW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named Inventor	: David A. Broden et al.	
Appln. No.:	10/679,907	
Filed	: October 6, 2003	Group Art Unit: 2855
For	: PROCESS SEAL FOR PROCESS CONTROL TRANSMITTER	Examiner: Allen, Andre J.
Docket No.:	R11.12-0788	

RESPONSE

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER IS BEING SENT BY U.S. MAIL, FIRST CLASS, TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450, THIS

26 DAY OF Sept, 2005.

PATENT ATTORNEY

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is response to the Office Action of July 1, 2005. In the Office Action, claims 1-12 were rejected while claims 13-24 were withdrawn from consideration. It is believed that all pending 1-24 claims are in consideration for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

In section 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner discusses the Restriction Requirement. Applicant notes that, as discussed below, independent claim 1 is allowable. Further, independent claim 1 is generic to independent claim 13 in that the claims have a genus/species relationship. More specifically, a transmitter (claim 13) is a specific type of process control instrument (claim 1). As noted by the Examiner, independent claim 13 includes an isolation diaphragm arrangement which is not in claim 1. Thus, independent claim 13 is a subset (i.e. species) within the genus (claim 1) of process control instruments. Therefore, it is believed that claims 13-24 should remain in the case.